



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

really for Plymouth Church, that has not feared war when war was demanded by honor, but will not accept war if peace can be maintained with honor. And I believe I am speaking for the Christian church from ocean to ocean, and I pray God that thousands of ministers are speaking to-night as I am speaking. And I am speaking for business men, who do not speak, but want others to voice their sentiments for them. And I am speaking for mothers whose hearts beat quick with horror at the thought of a broken household, and the boy marching off to battle. Let us have peace. (Applause.)

### THE TRUE MISSION OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

BY REV. REUEN THOMAS, D.D.

From an address delivered before the Congregational Club of Chicago, Feb. 17.

There has been a tendency in all limited monarchies, England only excepted, to turn into absolute monarchies. Of all monarchies, there is none so simply ornamental as the English monarchy, and none so unconsciously influential. I apprehend that in our day the wish for republicanism in England is confined to a few doctrinaires. The majestic figurehead of a ship has scarcely less control over the rudder than has an English sovereign over English politics and administrative government. England is today a monarchical republic.

It is necessary to recognize that there are and always have been two streams of tendency, two ideas of nationality in England, fundamentally one, when the very greatest causes have been at issue, but ordinarily in no very friendly attitude toward each other. They are represented sufficiently well for our purpose by the words Tory and Liberal. The Tory party is the party of privilege. Its worst expression is an hereditary House of Lords—not elected, not amenable to the people—blocking the way of legislation when it is safe to do it, and except in some of its most intelligent and distinguished members, entirely devoid of popular sympathies. The Liberal party represents all that is most humane and progressive in English life. In judging of English speech and English life it is always necessary to distinguish between the English people and English Toryism. Unfortunately, English Toryism, led by its most insolent and aristocratic representative, the man who represents more than any other man the jingoism of England, is now in power. With a majority at his back which is too large for the comfort or happiness of those who, like myself, have no confidence in Tory government, this man is yet amenable to the English people, who, in case of threatened disaster, would summarily call him to order, either by direct appeal to the crown, or by insisting on a direct appeal to the country. You would not be interested in anything of detail as to the causes which defeated the Liberals and put the present Tory government into power. But it is necessary, in order to an appreciation of that which follows, that I should ask you to remember that with all England's love of freedom and moral order, and with all its tendency to enterprise and action, Toryism is a reactionary force in English life, and does not represent the best thought and feeling of the English people.

To that Liberal party in the English nation all America is more closely allied, both by blood-relationship, by popular sympathies, by ideas and affections, by literature, by religion, by modes and methods of government and

by the ideals which control our life than to any other people of the world. And if it should be said in reply that this America of ours is far too composite to allow of so sweeping a statement as that being admitted without debate, the facts which justify that statement are not far to seek. That Liberal party in England which has got itself into historical expression represents a similar party in every country of Europe. The difference between that party in England and the same party in other European countries is in this: that owing to influences which have been at work in England since as far back as 1165, when on English soil 30 weavers in the diocese of Worcester were summoned before the council of Oxford and asked what they meant by saying that they were Christians and revered the teachings of the Apostles, they "were scourged and branded as heretics and then driven out of the city to perish in the winter's cold," from that time forth we find here and there the manifestation of that spirit of independent inquiry and of energetic freedom which sought ever to realize a higher life, showing itself now in William of Occam in the end of the 13th century, now in the poetry of Chaucer, now in the brave and learned John Wickliffe of Lutterworth, the seeds of whose broad sowing were scattered even in Germany, and grew into the reformation; now more manifestly in those men who sought a temporary asylum in Holland and came here, after learning something there, to be celebrated by us as the Pilgrim Fathers, the founders of our New England life and inferentially our American constitution.

These men represent similar men in France and in Germany, in Austria and in Italy. In Germany, that for which the English Liberal party has always stood, focussed itself in Luther and broke out into the reformation. In France it was illustrated in the Huguenots. In Italy in those Protestant peoples in the valleys of Piedmont. In Austria in Huss and his followers. In England that spirit succeeded in winning for itself the right to be, and from that day to this has confronted Toryism with more or less of successful endeavor, standing for religious liberty and for political enfranchisement.

In Germany it has given us all that is most forceful and hopeful in that land of philosophical, scientific and literary criticism. Yet in Germany that spirit has never had the freedom and power which it has had in England.

In France it was ruthlessly suppressed, and the purest and most valorous blood in France was dried up and made all but unproductive, so far as France herself was concerned. The hugest blunder France ever made in all her history was the massacre and scattering of the Huguenots. The religious liberalism of Southern Europe has been persecuted to the death; yet it still lives, and is not ashamed of itself. It is out of sight but still lives.

We hear very little of those peoples, as liberal in their feelings and ideas as ourselves, who hide away in the valleys of Piedmont and other valleys of northern Italy, but they represent that which is represented by English Liberalism in this day and in all days—by the Huguenot ideas and feelings, reviving once again in France—by the Lutheranism of Germany, not so free as it ought to be—represented most fully and conspicuously in the world today by the freedom, the aspirations, the struggle, the activity, the idealism of the United States. I say most fully and conspicuously. We must not forget however, that the English Liberalism, in religion and in politics, whose ideas and aspirations we have inherited

and illustrated, has always had its freest opportunity wherever English speaking colonies have been formed. In Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, in Cape Colony, the old English Toryism, which once concentrated itself so fatally in the despotic brain of George III. and his advisers, has never been able to establish itself or to perpetuate, except under a very mild and harmless form, its peculiar ideas. In these great colonies the same religious and political freedom is found as in the United States—the same ideas dominate—the same opportunities present themselves to man and woman there as here. In none of the colonies, as in the mother country, is there a dominant and torified state church. The same consciousness of freedom and equality is found in New Zealand and Australia as in our own country. A fact, I beg to suggest, which reveals that the heart of England is not really Tory, and that whatever temporary reaction may come as now, owing largely to the party of progress attempting too much, it is only the reflux wave returning to the ocean to get itself re-enforced with fuller volume and mightier energy.

Compared with its past, even Toryism itself has become liberalized. The Tories of to-day tell us that they are the Liberals of 25 years ago, and that the Liberals have vacated their old respectable sane position, and have become something else, for which they want a fitting name.

Now that which I would that we should see more plainly than seems possible to quite a number of our people, whose minds appear to be confined within very narrow areas of capacity, is, that the conflicts in the past between England and America have been the same conflict and of the same nature as the conflicts between Toryism and Liberalism in England itself, and that America could make no bigger blunder or commit no greater crime than by playing into the hands of English Tories, the natural enemies of a true Liberalism everywhere. I am quite sure, that whether you are able to accept my views and opinions on the theme which has been given me, or not, you will, as Congregationalists, to whom freedom and independence are only second to righteousness and love, not desire that I should give utterance to anything else than that which to my own conscience and intelligence is according to the truth of things. If we are to understand the present, we must be acquainted with the past. We must have the historical faculty. We must recognize that the present is by natural law evolved from the past, that it is not something forced—not something accidental—but that which bears the same relation to the past as fruit to seed. If the present be wild oats, it is because in the past men sowed wild oats. If the present is the whirlwind, it is because in the past men sowed the wind.

One of the dangerous features of our own country's life at the present time, that which makes our political sky look threatening and uncertain, is that the men who represent or misrepresent us, in our Legislatures and especially in our Houses of Congress, do not seem very much (a majority of them, at any rate) to be acquainted with history and to recognize that always and ever there is a divine law of righteousness working through it. One can forgive schoolboys' recklessness of speech and deed while out on the playground. Everybody knows they are at play. But when one gets the impression of a House of Representatives that they are at play, that there is no solemn, judicial seriousness in them, why then, God help us, for vain is the help of man.

We are apt to assume that when responsibility is put on a man, like the great Abraham Lincoln, he will rise to the dignity of his position and become serious. All the intelligence, heart, conscience, reason, in the man will rise into emperorship over his soul. Even the jokes of Lincoln were more serious than the prayers of many men who criticised him. It was said of Gladstone in the House of Commons, that he would have been more agreeable to many of the members if he had not been so tremendously in earnest. Probably, but then he would never have been Gladstone. He might have been Palmerston or Disraeli, but not Gladstone. Now when we carefully read the history of these two nations, that England and this America, we cannot disguise from ourselves that there is a relation between them which does not exist, and cannot exist between any other nations. Whatever other entangling alliances may be made with other peoples, they will be artificial compared with the relationship which must exist between England and America. Take the two factors of blood and language into account. Do they stand for nothing? Can anything stand for so much?

People of unhistorical minds—with little development of reason and conscience—with no religious depth of nature (for a religious man always has more depth of nature than an irreligious man) may try to get themselves into the belief that certain surface interests will be promoted by war between these English speaking races—but no man who is through and through a man, and not simply a ferocious animal on the way, it may be, to become a man, can long hold that idea in his mind and heart without shuddering. The greater our manhood capacity the more vision have we into the human relations of things and the more adequately we estimate their value. There is no higher type of man to be found in the Christian church of our day than a first quality of Christian merchant, a man who is always greater as a man than he is as a merchant—a man the amplitude of whose being it is not possible to confine within the limitations of any commercial enterprise. Specimens of such men you have here in Chicago. They are found in all our cities—men who at heart have the disposition to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness—men diligent in business, fervent in spirit, “serving the Lord.” No finer specimen of Christian manhood is to be found. That man's judgment on great questions is worth something. But I will not trust the judgment of a man who is only and always a merchant—and nothing else. I will not trust the judgment of a man whose apostle's creed is as brief and concentrated as this: “I and mine and me.” Outside of his business I will not trust that man's judgment. On great causes and issues I have no need for him. When I meet with a man who thinks it will be good for trade to kill somebody—to have a war with somebody—good for his trade—I have no use for that man. If it is good for his trade that he should kill somebody, why not me if that will serve his turn?

I have no interest in such a man's Christian confessions. Any Christianity which is not humanity is not Christianity. When nations are gathered before the judgment seat as in that dramatic 25th chapter of St. Matthew's gospel, the test of righteousness or unrighteousness of Christians or anti-Christians is humanity—simply and solely. I say any form of Christianity which does not issue in a tenderer and nobler humanity is external, ecclesiastical and formal. Any theology and any

patriotism which you cannot turn into prayer is bad. The gospel of hate is as diametrically opposed to the gospel of love as hell is to heaven. Any Christianity which does not humanize a man bears evidence palpable to all intelligent investigators of being diseased at the heart. Any Christianity which allows a man to talk of war as if it were simply a boy's game of foot ball is only skin deep. Mr. Balfour, the leader of the English House of Commons, in the present government, in a speech in Manchester, England, several weeks ago spoke of the "unnatural horror" of a war with the United States. He also remarked that from what he had seen in American newspapers the levity with which such a catastrophe to humanity itself was treated was the most surprising and alarming feature in the whole business. These writers "appeared to regard a war with England as a thing to be lightly indulged in—an exhilarating exercise—a great stimulus." I think any real statesman would speak with similar gravity. It is this frothy levity of speech—this indication of mental incapacity to realize the dreadfulness to humanity of such a murderous conflict between these nations—this heartlessness in jesting about such a possibility—this paralysis of the imagination which surely in the darkness and silence of night, if not in the garish light of the busy day to paint the frightful picture before the vision,—it is all this dreadful moral defect in people who talk and write, which must bring deepest sadness into the souls of all thinking Christian men. It is a revelation that our Christianity has not gone very deep, and that the specialty of our possible (I will not say manifest) destiny has not been appreciated by the loud and noisy part of our population.

Glorious ideals have risen up before the imagination of the noblest specimens of American men and women. But all these ideals have been associated with peace, plenty, intelligence, unity and religion. They have all been associated with freedom from the entangling alliances into which European nations have come. They have been associated with humane feelings as to uplifting the population to a happier life. Never have these rose-colored visions of a dawn which betokened a glorious noon been associated with base imitations of the most murderous element to be found in Europe or Asia or Africa. Somebody has said that we are a nation of dollar-hunters. Better by far be that than a nation of scalp-hunters. There is a record in one of Mr. John Fiske's books of a dinner given in Paris some years ago by Americans to Americans, at which there were, of course, sundry toasts, and among them this: "Here's to the United States, bounded on the north by British America, on the south by the Gulf of Mexico, on the East by the Atlantic, and on the west by the Pacific Ocean." The second speaker meant to go one better, and thought that the future was to be seen in the present. Improving on the first speaker, he said: "Here's to the United States, bounded on the north by the north pole, on the south by the south pole, on the east by the rising sun, and on the west by the setting sun." This prophecy was greeted by loud applause. But boundaries seemed to be below the notice of a gentleman from the far West, whose unharnessed imagination, like a winged Pegasus, knew not how to keep itself to earth, and thus he spoke: "If," said he, "we are to leave history and flap our wings in the golden cloud-land of prophecy, why halt and hesitate as have done our friends who have preceded me? I give you the United States bounded on the north by the aurora

borealis, on the south by the precession of the equinoxes, on the east by the primeval chaos, and on the west by the day of judgment." This seemingly wildest of all these fervid speakers may not be so legitimately subject to ridicule as at first he seemed to be. This might have been his glowingly poetical way of saying: The cause of America is humanity's cause. It is not bounded by earth. It began in heaven. The hope of humanity is in influences we did not originate and which we cannot control. The past has been chaos. Looking toward the east, we see turmoil, strife and confusion. Looking westward we see a new nationality based on the necessity for humanity's deliverance from those forces which have brought perpetual chaos in the East. Only the day of judgment can tell how far we shall be true to that great destiny which has idealized itself before the imagination of our noblest and best. Hence I am not disposed to regard the seemingly blatant words of our rhapsodical friend at the Paris-American dinner as altogether trivial and unseemly. The day of judgment is the one most solemn fact which no Christian mind can consistently deny. It is the terminus ad quem of every nation's history. I need not recall to the memory of any careful reader that the judgment scene pictured before us in the end of St. Matthew's gospel is in nations rather than individuals.

That which is common to England and America is the contention for a higher order of civilization than seemed to be possible to men before these factors came into operation and influence in the world's life — English blood — the English language — English ideas of freedom to worship God — English ideas of representative government, based on the perception which underlies all democracy, that humanity is of more value and importance than any of its accidents, an idea, let me say, for which it is impossible to get permanent currency where Christianity is not a living force. These ideas are not Tory in their complexion. They are underneath that English Liberalism which was illustrated in the teachings of Wycliffe, the Pilgrim Fathers and many others. That Christian Liberalism of which Milton was the poet, Bunyan, the allegorist; Cromwell, the soldier; Hampden, the noblest example. These represented but a movement which was found in almost every European country, which movement triumphed most signally when Washington successfully fought the battles of Liberal Englishmen the world over. For if after carefully reading history, I should be asked, who, of all men, gave England her present strength, and made it possible for her to expand beyond the limitations of that Toryism which is both insular and insolent, I should be compelled to say Washington. For it was Washington's success which changed the whole policy of England in relation to her colonies. All educated Englishmen in our day (leaving out, perhaps, a few of the men belonging to the party which John Stuart Mill has called the stupid party in English politics) recognize the fact that Washington was fighting the battles of the English people the world over, and that his success strengthened England more than it damaged her. None but the most prejudiced of men — men of unhistorical minds and feeble imagination — can deny that the centres of Christian civilization are in these two countries. Great Britain and America (for as the Scotchman said, England was only Britain till Scotland annexed her to herself, and then she became Great Britain). The civilization for which these two nationalities stand, I venture to say, is higher in idea than that of any other nationalities. If these coun-

tries do not attain to something which can be called Christian civilization, as distinct from the old paganized civilization, then there is no Christian civilization in sight. Now, then, civilization, as one says, "means quite a number of things." But there is no doubt that on its political side, it means primarily, the gradual substitution of a state of peace for a state of war.

This change is the condition precedent for all the other kinds of improvement that are connected by such a term as "civilization." Manifestly the development of industry is largely dependent upon the cessation or restriction of warfare — and, furthermore, as the industrial phase of civilization slowly supplants the military phase, men's characters undergo, though very slowly, a corresponding change. Men become less inclined to destroy life or inflict pain, or, to use the terminology which coincides with that of the doctrine of evolution, they become less brutal and more humane. Obviously then, the prime feature of the process called civilization is the general diminution of warfare.

We may say that the war temper — the temper which on all occasions of dispute sinks reason and exalts passion — is (to use the language of evolution), the brute coming to the front, and not the man. One would suppose that there ought to be very few men in this 19th century, if all we say about education and enlightenment be true, unable to see that. But we have to be taught, it may be by painful experiences, that an education which stops short of humanizing and Christianizing the heart of man, is no richer in its quality than the education of Rome and Greece, leaving us little better than cultured pagans. It becomes us to remember that the great wars of the past have, with very few exceptions indeed, been wars against some form of barbarism. What would a war with England be in our day, or a war of England with America, a war, not against barbarism, but against civilization? Everybody who in this world represented any type of barbarism would delight in it. The Emperor of Russia would hear no more about Siberia for a long time to come. And his Satanic majesty the Sultan might massacre all his Christianized subjects in all parts of his empire, none daring to make him afraid.

These scalp-hunters of our time, some of them, seem bent on finishing what Napoleon left unfinished — the humiliation of England. They have been exalting Napoleon and Napoleonism — as if that had not more than anything else brought on France the greatest humiliation any war-like nation ever had. Why no one knows but the Prince of darkness himself. But, thanks to George Washington, England to-day is not the England of Napoleon's time. It is Canada, Australia, New Zealand and other names. There cannot be a question that the jingoism of our day is uniting the English colonies to the mother country closer than ever before. There cannot be a doubt that it is playing into the hands of English Toryism more powerfully than any other influence which has arisen in our time. It will add, I know not how many more battleships to that terrible incubus on the English people, the English fleet! Nobody knows how much additional taxation it means there and here. To all this, men of the kind I name are heartless and blind. I know what these men say — I am not ignorant of their speech — I have read it until it has almost turned the milk of human kindness in me sour — I have felt as felt Judge Haliburton (Sam Slick), who in his "Wise Saws," wrote years ago; "Now we are two great nations, the

greatest by a long chalk of any in the world — speak the same language — have the same religion, and our constitutions don't differ no great odds. We ought to draw closer than we do.

"We are big enough, equal enough, and strong enough not to be jealous of each other. United we are more than a match for all the other nations put together, and can defy their fleets, armies and millions. Single, we couldn't stand against all, and if one was to fall, where would the other be? Mourning over the grave that covers a relative whose place can never be filled. It is authors of silly books, editors of silly papers, and demagogues of silly parties that help to estrange us. I wish there was a gibbet high enough and strong enough to hang up all these enemies of mankind on." So much for Judge Haliburton. For myself, I am no hangman, and since I learned as a boy the beautiful words, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God," I have never halted or hesitated in praying the prayer, "Scatter thou the people who delight in war." I think, however, that unless the very existence of all that is best and most precious in a country's life is at stake (as in the case of the civil war here) none but volunteers and men who have written and preached jingoism ought to be expected or required, or even allowed to go to war; and those ought to be compelled. I believe in the old song of "Let those that make the quarrels be the only men to fight."

The mission to the world of these two nations is manifestly not that of the pagan elements in them. The best elements must come to the front to shame the worst. Alas, the best are the quietest, the worst the noisiest. Notoriety is no proof of merit. A thousand dollars' worth of roses will only perfume a few yards, while a dollar's worth of cooked onions will scent up a whole town. But I believe in the church of Christ yet. Notwithstanding its follies, which are many, and its stupidities, which are by no means few, I believe in its influence and power. If it were not so foolish and stupid it might be stronger by far than it is. But the most inartistic and even fantastically carved image of a man may hold in its hand a lamp whose light shall keep many a foot from stumbling — many a ship from wreck. It is at our peril that we attempt to compromise with many of these forces which are misleading and degrading the people. We must not allow them to put extinguishers on that light which Christ gave us to hold aloft for the sake of an unhumanized and a dehumanized world. When folks talk about a patriotism which hates, we must talk about a patriotism which loves. When they talk about a patriotism which destroys, we must talk about a patriotism which saves. When they talk about a patriotism which divides, we must talk about a patriotism which unites. There is a patriotism, as old Dr. Johnson said, "which is the last refuge of a scoundrel," and there is a patriotism sweet and pure, high and holy, like that of him who wept over Jerusalem, "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc. There is a patriotism which, as Browning says, "is the easiest virtue for a selfish man to acquire." The only patriotism which does not expose a man to suspicion is that which is in agreement with all other virtues possessed by a man who claims to have a natural right to be the exponent of his country's best and purest life. "The patriot who really appreciates the valuable principles of his nation's life is he who most intrepidly rebukes the nation's faults." Democracy is a bridge over which you

can carry industrialism with safety—but if you add despotism, your bridge will reveal that it was never built to carry that. Militarism is despotism. It cannot be anything else. Wherever it is predominant in a nation, to talk of freedom is to talk nonsense. There is not, nor can there be either English or American freedom. Have the legislators freedom in Germany today? Have the judges? Have the political economists? Have the preachers in pulpits? Not in our sense of the word freedom. Before his death, Victor Hugo had his suspicions that ambitious adventurers among politicians might conduct democracy down the road that leads to the precipice. He writes: "The Democratic idea, the new bridge of civilization, is just now undergoing the formidable trial of overweight. Every other idea would certainly give way under the load it is made to bear. Democracy proves its solidity by the absurdities that are heaped upon it without shaking it. It must bear everything that people choose to place upon it. At this moment they are attempting to make it carry despotism. Democracy cannot carry militarism (which is despotism) without losing its character as Democracy. Whenever I hear this war cry in Europe, I immediately begin to investigate the internal condition of the country in which it is raised, for be sure, in nine cases out of ten, there is a grave reason for turning the attention of the people from themselves and their domestic disabilities to some assumed foreign foe. When I hear the old screech revived here I cannot but inquire what there is in our internal life which will not bear investigation? Are men losing faith in peaceful Democracy? During these last 30 years since the blot of slavery was cleansed from the forehead it disfigured; this America has been the wonder and envy of less favored lands. Why? Because she has great armies, great fleets, foes afraid of her, suspecting her and hating her (for suspicion and hatred are always very close together)? Nay. Nay. Because she had not these things. Because she needed them not. Because she was out of the strifes which have made Europe an armed camp. Here representatives of all the nations in Europe are living together peacefully. There is no other part of the earth where the variety in unity is possible. Why is it possible here? Because we are gradually developing a spirit of amity and good will between men—gradually creating the peaceful spirit. Create the warlike spirit and this domestic peacefulness will not long exist. Read history. After every great foreign war—domestic amity has been all but impossible. I believe that if the jingo spirit became supreme it would ruin the United States in 50 years. It would be at war with all the world in 20 years, and, as all the world is here, it would create internal discord which would threaten the existence of the Union itself—the man on horseback would be here, and nothing possible but a military despotism. I say, read history.

Let me give you an extract from one of the noblest men who ever stood in the English House of Commons to charm and fascinate it with his eloquence—I mean John Bright. In 1815 the battle of Waterloo was fought. The Teutonic and Latin races had their pitched battle here and notwithstanding that the Latin races had as their leader the greatest military general of modern times, the victory was not on their side. It was on the side of morality, liberty and the Protestant religion. For a few brief weeks England was jubilant. But what followed? John Bright's words are these: "From 1813 to 1822 this

country was never in a more uneasy position. The sufferings of the working classes were beyond description, and the difficulties and struggles and bankruptcies of the middle classes were such as few persons have a just idea of. There was scarcely a year in which there was not an incipient insurrection in some parts of the country arising from the sufferings which the working classes endured."

We have not forgotten that when Napoleonism had played its last card and lost—its humiliation complete—that the German conquerors were far more merciful to Paris and other parts of France than were the Communists. Now, if in homogeneous populations like England and France such conditions could follow great wars, what would be the conditions in a heterogeneous population like this? One's imagination reels to think of it.

Ignorance in men placed in positions of power is as disastrous as vice in men generally. These men attribute results to causes that cannot carry them. They say that England is great because she is military. No mistake could be greater. She is great because she is industrial—because she is enterprising—because she has for hundreds of years had large families and had to colonize. Underneath all her industrialism and enterprise has been the Protestant religiousness of her people. America is great for these same reasons and causes. England has taken a thousand millions sterling (five thousand millions of dollars) every twenty years out of the industry of her hard working people to pay for wars into which she was tempted or forced. Says John Bright: "Apply that huge sum for one simple period of twenty years to objects of good in this country and it would be rendered more like a paradise than anything that history records of man's condition." Every poor man's cottage might have been built of marble and every man over sixty in the country might have had ample provision for a peaceful old age.

The fact is when men talk of war they know not of what they talk. In a word they advocate the bringing back of barbarism and paganism to take the place of Christianity. When I hear these men, I am reminded of a question of Erasmus, in which he inquires respecting a monk who had made himself heard, "What right has he to denounce Latin, of which he knows little; science, of which he knows less; and Greek, of which he knows nothing? He had better have confined himself to the seven deadly sins, with which perhaps he had closer acquaintance."

The Jingoism in England and the Jingoism in America are a dangerous class of people. Disraeli and Lord Salisbury represent those over yonder of this insolent, dogmatic temperament. I am not at liberty to quote names over here, which would be as dangerous as these if they were as powerful. The English people and the truly Americanized American people are not of this temper. They are alike capable of keeping passion chained and letting loose reason and conscience. I believe in a Christianized populace as the only safety of the state. Princes have been weighed and found wanting. Politicians have been weighed and found wanting. Statesmen are so few and far between that when we meet one we are half afraid of him, because of his strange superiority to the rest of those who at public dinners are complimented with the term.

There is a Christian populace in England which will take good heed that no English politician shall part these



nationalities in the great work to humanity that, united, they are capable of doing.

There is a Christian populace here which is sane and sober and serious, if only you will give it time. That Christian populace represents a spirit higher and nobler than the civilized paganism of much of our fashionable society. For the sake of the people generally, for the sake of those who are honestly disposed peacefully to do their day's work for the sake of industrialism—general contentment—general prosperity—in order that this land may be the best for the world's workers, even if it is the worst for the world's idlers, we are in duty bound to take as our motto "Peace on earth, good will toward men." If these two nations hold together—settle every thing that is discordant by arbitration, be determined that there shall be no deadly warfare between English speaking peoples, no one can forecast the greatness of their future. But it is Christianity which must do the work, not mere ecclesiasticism. Christianity must be made to mean something it has never meant in the world yet. If we could get all the Christians Christianized, lifted to the level of the ideas and feelings which dominate that New Testament which enshrines the Christ whom we profess to take as sovereign as well as saviour, the united voice of a Christianized church would be an influence and a power which no politicians would dare to challenge. The trouble is, that Christians are not Christianized. They know not how to take truth and turn it into life. As a general principle this may be accepted—that we can always get more out of unity than out of division. It is so between man and man, city and city, state and state, nation and nation. A loud call has come to the Christianized people in Great Britain and the United States to declare themselves as never before, in favor of a permanent court of international arbitration for all English speaking peoples. Already representatives of humane thought and feeling in England are moving, and leading statesmen are giving no uncertain sound. Mr. Balfour is the leader of the House of Commons. On two public occasions he has seized the opportunity to express his opinion that England and America must move together in the van of civilization. There is scarcely a pulpit in that land where a similar sentiment has not recently found expression.

A great opportunity is offered. Does our Christianity mean anything for this world? Can it lift civilization from the pagan level to a higher level? Or is it to stop on the level of a wrangling ecclesiasticism? Are the men of narrow views to lead and control us? Are there no great men with great ideas, and great visions, and great aims? Here in Chicago you have great ambitions. Let them be holy ambitions. You have summoned a Parliament of Religions. You have had a World's Fair. I appeal to the churches here to take the lead in such an organized movement as shall make it impossible to settle differences between English speaking peoples except as reasonable beings who believe in humanity, because they believe in God's Christ. If our Christianity is to be the little dog running behind the political carriage drawn by the two parties who are harnessed together in the government of this nation—a barking cur trained to obedience to its political masters—the sooner the life is kicked out of the yelping thing the better. Unless it is an angel of God, having the everlasting gospel to preach to all men everywhere, of all peoples, nations and languages—it is a usurper of a throne to which it has no right.

At an important meeting held in Sion College, Lon-

don, Jan. 14, the following resolutions, moved by W. Hazell, M. P., and seconded by Canon Wilberforce, were unanimously passed:

We, the undersigned, desire to express our deep conviction that, whatever may be the differences between the governments in the present or the future, all English-speaking peoples, united by race, language and religion, should regard war as the one absolutely intolerable mode of settling the domestic differences of the Anglo-American family.

As any appeal to the arbitrament of the sword in disputes between English-speaking nations is repudiated by the conscience of the race, we would respectfully suggest to our government that the present is a "fit occasion" for giving effect to the resolutions in favor of arbitration passed by the House of Commons and by both Houses of Congress.

Without expressing any opinion upon pending controversies which may be regarded as sub judice, we would earnestly press the advisability of promptly providing some treaty arrangement by which all disputes between Britain and the United States could be referred for adjudication to some permanent tribunal representing both nations, and uniting them in the common interest of justice and peace.

An able committee was appointed to give effect to these resolutions and to secure signatures to the declarations embodied in them from leaders of all denominations. In this committee we note the names of such men as the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott), Cardinal Vaughan, Dean Farrar, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, Dr. Clifford, Dr. Adler, Lady Henry Somerset, Mr. W. T. Stead.

Such resolutions from Christianized men of all ecclesiastical orders express, I do not doubt, the feeling of nine-tenths of the people of Great Britain. I wish that I could believe that they express also the feeling of nine-tenths of the people of the United States. Then the future of the higher civilization would be secured so far as these English speaking peoples are concerned. Great soldiers and great men in all departments are not warlike. Boys are natural jingoes. Full grown men never—all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding. Says Gen. Grant: "Though I have been trained as a soldier, and have participated in many battles, there never was a time when in my opinion some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. I look forward to an epoch when a court, recognized by all nations, will settle international differences, instead of keeping large standing armies, as they do in Europe."

Said General Sheridan at a banquet in Philadelphia in 1886: "I mean what I say when I express the belief that any who may live to the next centennial (in 1987), will find that arbitration will rule the whole world." But what is the use of quoting? Hardly a man of any greatness at all in any department of life—in any nation—or among any people—but has had the same feeling and expressed the same ideas. Among the nations, whoever has the light has the leading. These two nations may follow the men of light and leading—or they may like the Jews—like the Greeks—like the Romans, be faithless to the light they have, and follow not the leaders, but the misleaders in society. God grant it may not be so. God grant that a Christianized democracy may arise in both nations to save us from a heartless aristocracy or a selfish plutocracy. But, better still, God grant that internally all classes may come into fraternal union and mutual helpfulness—and externally all who speak the tongue that Shakespeare spoke may get into deeper and deeper sympathy with the poet of the heather and the burn: "It's coming fit for a' that—that man to man the world o'er shall brothers be and a' that."